

a much more useful contribution to science. I omitted mention of this paper because no infections were obtained from pure cultures, because the two organisms which were isolated were not described so as to be identifiable, and finally, because I was describing a specific germ and not writing a general treatise on cabbage diseases of which there appear to be several due to bacteria. The one man who has written on this organism so that other bacteriologists can make something out of his writings is Professor L. H. Pammel, to whom I gave full credit. Since the paper in question was written I have removed the final shadow of doubt respecting the identity of the organism which Professor Pammel described and the one I have studied, by the discovery that whether it *does* or *does not* liquify gelatin is an accident depending entirely on how the gelatin is made.—ERWIN F. SMITH, *Washington, D. C.*

[WE PUBLISH the above at Dr. Smith's request. Dr. Smith could hardly have written it had he awaited the promised comments when Dr. Russell's paper was noticed (see p. 211). The reviewer was cognizant of the facts which Dr. Smith relates above (and some others) when the statement he quotes was written, and sees no occasion to change his judgment. It was as far from his thoughts then as now to charge Dr. Smith with improper use of information; nor can such an implication be found in the review. Dr. Smith is certainly entitled to the full credit of independent work. The complaint was rather that it was *too* independent (witness the allegation, "at no time have I . . . had any desire to know what he [Russell] was doing"); and we can see no explanation of the studious avoidance of any reference to the antecedent and contemporary work of Dr. Russell, of which, by his own statement, he *was* "fully cognizant." We leave readers to judge of the validity of the reasons assigned for passing over it in silence. We only remark that, under the circumstances, Dr. Smith had every reason to know that the disease described by Russell, even though imperfectly, was identical with the one he was working upon. Nor does he improve his relation to the matter by magnifying now the errors of that preliminary notice. In newspaper parlance the earlier publication of important information constitutes a "scoop," and in newspaper rivalry, to "scoop" a competitor is not only legitimate, but praiseworthy. It is hardly so regarded in scientific work.—EDS.]

BOTANY AT BROWN UNIVERSITY.

To the Editors of the Botanical Gazette:—I think it is my privilege to correct a wrong impression likely to be conveyed by the recent notice of my *Notebook* in the GAZETTE. Personally I am wholly indifferent to the criticism, but as my university is involved in the charge of erroneous teaching, I feel bound to say a word in her defense.

It is said in the review that a glimpse is here given of the mode of teaching botany at Brown. A glimpse, yes; a comprehensive view, no. My *Notebook* is designed wholly for primary students and has been found to meet its purpose admirably well. Histology and the lower cryptogams,

involving use of compound microscopes and reagents, are thoroughly studied by select students.

As to the point at which a course of botany should begin, opinions differ, and we acknowledge no infallible head to decide the question. East of the Hudson, at least, there are many who agree with us, that while theoretically it is right to begin with the cell, it is impracticable with large undergraduate classes pursuing the course only three hours a week. As to the interest, it is certainly debatable whether the study of morphology is not quite as interesting, and for academic courses as inspiring, as the development of the *punctum vegetationis*. As a matter of fact, so-called "analysis" occupies but a few weeks of our course.—WM. WHITMAN BAILEY, *Brown University*.

[WE ARE sorry that Professor Bailey thinks that "histology" and the "punctum vegetationis" are the only recourse for those who would not begin botany with the "analysis" of spermatophytes. We do not consider it debatable at all as to whether morphology or histology is the more "inspiring" to the beginning student. We agree entirely with Professor Bailey's position in this matter. We only thought that a little less intricate terminology would give more time for morphology, and allow some of the lower forms to come in.—EDS.]